

Appl. No. 10/806,926

Amdt. Dated May 9, 2005

Reply to Office Action of February 10, 2005

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed February 10, 2005. Applicant has amended claim 1 and added new claims 21 and 22. In view of these remarks Applicant believes the application should be allowed.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Groenenberg Patent No. 6,277,059 ("Groenenberg"). Applicant traverses this rejection because Groenenberg fails to teach each of the elements of claim 1. Claim 1 requires an input table attached to the housing for feeding paper sheets into the housing for processing the paper sheets according to the position of the adjustment bar, a stacking table attached to the housing for receiving the processed paper sheets exiting the housing, and a stacking arm attached to the housing adjacent the stacking table, the stacking arm having a roller for assisting in stacking of the processed paper sheets exiting the housing. Claim 1 also requires a mechanical link connecting the stacking arm to the adjustment bar and the mechanical link providing for adjustment of the stacking arm relative to the type of fold provided by the fold plate.

Groenenberg fails to disclose each of the elements of claim 1. Groenenberg discloses rollers 42 and a stationary shaft 43 which are part of a transport roller system 33 as depicted in Fig. 4. This transport roller system 33, stationary shaft 43 and rollers 42 are not attached to the housing adjacent a stacking table. Nor do these components assist in stacking of paper sheets exiting the housing. Groenenberg discloses that this transport roller system is "for supplying the sheets for collection to the collection tray." (Col. 4, lines 36-38.) The collection tray 10 is the area where the sheets of the machine for Groenenberg begin their processing. As shown in Fig. 1, the collecting tray 10 is not near the delivery station 8.

Appl. No. 10/806,926
Amdt. Dated May 9, 2005
Reply to Office Action of February 10, 2005

Groenenberg discloses that sheets are first received in the collection tray 10, then processed by the folding and creasing device 9, pressed flat in the creasing station 12 and "then delivered to the delivery station 8." (Col. 2, lines 50-59). Thus, Groenenberg fails to disclose that the roller 42 or stationary shaft 43 assist in stacking of processed paper sheets exiting the housing. In fact, Groenenberg teaches away, because the sheets are entering the machine at roller 42. As well, neither the roller 42 nor stationary shaft 43 are a "stacking arm", as required by claim 1.

Furthermore, there is no mechanical link depicted in Groenenberg that connects the stacking arm to the adjustment bar and the mechanical link providing for adjustment of the stacking arm relative to the type of fold provided by the fold plate as required by claim 1. In fact, Goenenberg fails to teach any mechanical links, as its means of adjusting components is via motors (Col. 3, line 51) and electronic sensors (Col. 5, line 41). Therefore, Groenenberg fails to disclose each of the elements of claim 1 and therefore the rejection under §102 is improper and Applicant respectfully requests that it be withdrawn.

Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by or in the alternative under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Groenenberg. Claim 11 depends from claim 1 and includes all the limitations thereof. As discussed above, claim 1 is not anticipated by Groenenberg. As well, Groenenberg fails to suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art all the elements of claim 1. Therefore, for all the reasons discussed above for claim 1; claim 11 is also allowable over Groenenberg.

Applicant has inserted new claims 21-22. Applicant believes that none of the cited art teaches or suggests these claims and they are in condition for allowance.